

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application and indicating that claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14-20, 22-31, 34-36, 39, 40, 42, 43, and 45-51 contain allowable subject matter.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on July 12, 2007. As a result of the interview, the Examiner withdrew the rejections of claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 28, 34, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as detailed in paragraphs 4 and 10 of the Office Action mailed May 7, 2007. These rejections are related to the use of word "speculatively" in the claims. Applicants reviewed the Examiner Interview Summary mailed July 24, 2007 and have nothing further to add at this time.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14-20, 22-31, 34-36, 39, 40, 42, 43, and 45-51 were pending in the present application. By way of this reply, claim 18 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 28, 34, 39, 43, and 51 are independent. The remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 34, 39, and 43.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22, 24-30, 34, 39, 40, 43, 46, and 51 are amended to correct antecedent basis issues. Claims 1, 14, 15, 22, 34, and 39 are also amended for clarity as are claims 48 and 50.

Further, claims 17, 34, 46, 48, and 50 are amended to clarify the scope of the invention. No new subject matter is added by these amendments as support may be found, for example, in paragraph [1044] and Figure 10 of the Specification.

Drawings

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate in the next action that the drawings filed on February 21, 2002 are accepted.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to for containing the following informalities: "arbitration cycles." Applicants thank the Examiner for suggesting a correction based on claim 27. Claim 6 is amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to remove "arbitration cycles." Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14-20, 22-31, 34-36, 39, 40, 42, 43, and 45-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 18 is canceled. Thus, the rejection is now moot with respect to claim 18. To the extent the rejection may still apply to the rest of the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 28, 34, and 51 are rejected as being indefinite because the Examiner found it unclear what "speculatively" meant within the structure of the claims. As

discussed above, the Examiner withdrew this rejection as a result of the Examiner Interview conducted on July 12, 2007.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 28, 34, and 51 are further rejected as being unclear as to whether the resource is allocated to a user when that specific user has not requested the resource, or the resource is allocated to the user when any user has not requested the resource. See Office Action mailed May 7, 2007 at paragraphs 5 and 11. Claim 1 is amended to recite “*allocating a first of the resources speculatively to a first of the users ..., absent a request for the first resource from the first user.*” Emphasis added. Thus, claim 1 specifically recites that the resource is speculatively allocated to a first user when the first user has not requested the resource. Claims 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 28, 34, and 51 are similarly amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 22 are rejected as being unclear whether “at least one user” is the same as “one of the users.” See Office Action mailed May 7, 2007 at paragraphs 6 and 12. Claims 1 and 22 are amended to replace “one of the users” with “a first of the users” and “at least one user” with “the first user,” thus making it clear that the first user is the same as a first of the users. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 15, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 34, and 39 are rejected for lack of antecedent basis for certain limitations. Specifically, claims 15 and 25 are rejected for lack of antecedent basis for “the one resource.” See Office Action mailed May 7, 2007 at paragraphs 7 and 15. Claims 24, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 34, and 39 are rejected for lack of antecedent basis for “the at least one resource.” See Office Action mailed May 7, 2007 at paragraphs 13, 14, 16, 18-20, and 22. Claim 28 is also

rejected for lack of antecedent basis for “at least one resource.” *See* Office Action mailed May 7, 2007 at paragraph 17. Claims 15, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 34, and 39 are amended to correct the identified antecedent basis issues. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 34, 46, 48, and 50 are rejected as being indefinite for being unclear as to how granting more resources to a single user can allow multicast operations. *See* Office Action mailed May 7, 2007 at paragraphs 8 and 21. Claim 17 is amended to recite “speculatively allocating more than one resource, including the first resource, to the first user for use during the access interval,” thus removing any reference to multicast operations. Claims 34, 46, 48, and 50 are similarly amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 43 is rejected for lack of antecedent basis for “the second group of requests.” *See* Office Action mailed May 7, 2007 at paragraph 23. Claim 43 is amended to provide antecedent basis for “the second group of requests.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner provided no specific rationale for the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 16, 19, 20, 23, 26, 27, 31, 35, 36, 40, 42, 45, 47, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, which is wholly improper. Applicants assert that these claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner maintains this rejection of these claims in the next action, clarification is requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 33226/944001; P6999).

Dated: August 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants